A WEEDY CRUCIFER AGAIN REACHES NORTH AMERICA. — The identification of a roadside weed from Yancey County, North Carolina was not difficult, but determining the correct name for the plant turned up several conflicts and proved to be a small "tour de force" through the literature. The plant, originally described as *Brassica cheiranthos* by Villars,[1] is apparently native in western, central and southern Europe. If the species were to be retained in *Brassica*, as was done for many years, there would be no nomenclatural problem. The plant would be referred to as *Brassica cheiranthos* Vill. However, most of the recent works dealing with this species place it in another genus. O. E. Schulz[2] not only revived the invalidly published generic name *Brassicella* of Fourreau[3] but in addition appears to have misapplied the name *Brassica erucastrum* L. to the species here considered. At least, this is essentially the conclusion of Dandy[4], who transferred *Brassica cheiranthos* Vill. to *Rhyncosinapis* to replace the name *R. erucastrum* (Vill.) Dandy earlier provided for the same taxon.[5] I do not know whether Dandy went over the same literature and specimens that were examined by Pugsley[6] but he reached the same conclusion, that the names *Brassica cheiranthos* and *B. erucastrum* do not apply to the same species as was assumed to be the case by Schulz. Pugsley points out that "the sheet in the Linnean Herbarium labelled "7. erucastrum?" by Linnaeus, contains two small plants of *Rhaphanus Raphanistrum* L. that look much more like *Erucastrum obtusangulum* than *Brassica cheiranthus.*"

Assuming for the moment that the species is not to be retained in *Brassica* and is not properly referrable to *Sinapis* or any other of the long established generic segregates of *Brassica*, we come back to the two divergent treatments of Schulz and Dandy. It is clear that *Brassicella*, published merely as a nomen in Fourreau's work, has to be dated from Schulz and was illegitimate when proposed because *Rhyn-*

---

[1]Prosp. Pl. Delph. 40. 1779.
[2]Engler's Bot. Jahrb. 54: Beibl. No. 119. 52-3. 1916.
[3]Ann. Soc. Linn. Lyon 16: 330. 1868.
[4]Watsonia 4: 41-42. 1957.
[5]Clapham, Tutin and Warburg, Fl. Brit. Isles 158. 1952.
[6]Journ. Bot. 74: 326. 1936.

cosinapis had been validly published by von Hayek[7] in the meantime. Schulz was wrong both as to the generic and to the specific names. We agree then, with Dandy, that the species is to be referred to by the name *Rhyncosinapis cheiranthos* (Vill.) Dandy.

The specimen that evoked the above was collected by Harry E. Ahles, No. 42855, with J. A. Duke, June 7, 1958, roadside, 1.8 miles southwest of Burnsville on N. C. 197, Yancey County, North Carolina. It was distributed as *Diplotaxis muralis*. This is not the first time *Rhyncosinapis cheiranthos* has reached the North American continent. Nearly one hundred years ago when Addison Brown was combing the ballast fillings around New York City for new introductions he found it in Hoboken, New Jersey.[8] I have examined Brown's specimens and they are correctly identified. At first, he used the name *Brassica monensis*, but later made the correction to *B. cheiranthos*. This species apparently did not gain a continuing foothold in our flora at that time and we have seen no evidence of its presence from then until that provided by the North Carolina collection cited above. The fact that this came from a roadside habitat far inland from a coastal port indicates that the species may well be on its way to becoming a part of our weedy flora. — REED C. ROLLINS, GRAY HERBARIUM OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

AN ALBINO FRUITED FORM OF GAULTHERIA PROCUMBENS

On September 11, 1958, I stopped my car in a temporary parking place opposite the Naval Facilities Station at Tom Nevers Head, Nantucket Island, Mass. As I left the car, I noticed that the front wheels were on a luxuriant bed of *Gaultheria procumbens* L. Intrigued by the robust appearance of the plants, I made a closer inspection of them. To my surprise, I discovered that the fruits were a creamy white with many of them being almost pure white.

Outside the perimeter of this bed of albino-fruited plants, there was a far greater area matted solidly with the usual red-fruited form. The fruits, flowers, and foliage of these plants were considerably smaller by comparison. Several

[7]Beih. Bot. Centralbl. 27: 260. 1911.
[8]Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 7: 123. 1880.